REMARKS

Claims 1-36 are pending and stand rejected. Claims 1-14, 17-30, and 33-36 are amended. Claims 1-36 are pending upon entry of this amendment.

Please reconsider the present application in view of the above amendments and following remarks. Applicants thank the Examiner for carefully considering the present application.

Examiner Interview

Applicants thank the Examiner for taking time to discuss claims 1 and 35 of the pending application with Applicants' representative in the Examiner Interview of December 13, 2007. During the interview, the Examiner agreed that claim 1 as amended herein is not anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,006,222 to Culliss. No specific agreement was reached for claim 35. As required by 37 C.F.R. § 1.133 and MPEP § 713.04 and agreed upon with the Examiner, the substance of the interview is incorporated in this amendment and reply.

Amendment to Specification

In the first paragraph of the Office Action, the Examiner noted that the trademarks used in the application should be capitalized and accompanied by the generic terminology. This change has been made throughout the specification. No new matter has been added.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC § 112

In paragraphs 2-4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 4 and 22 under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, for insufficient antecedent basis of the limitation "the plurality of terms." Claims 4 and 22 are amended to recite "the term" instead of "the plurality of terms." Claim 4's parent claim, claim 1, is amended to recite "the event being captured in the first device and associated with a term of an article." Claim 22's parent claim, claim 19, is amended to recite "the event comprising an occurrence associated with an article, the occurrence related to a term of the article." Applicants respectfully submit that claims 4 and 22 as amended have sufficient antecedent basis for

their limitations in their parent claims. Therefore, this rejection is respectfully mooted in view of the above amendments in claims 1, 4, 19, and 22.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 102(b) in View of Culliss

In paragraphs 5-19 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 15-24, 31-34, and 36 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,006,222 to Culliss ("Culliss"). This rejection is moot in view of the above amendments in independent claims 1, 19, and 36.

Independent claim 1 as amended recites:

> A method comprising:
>
> receiving in a second device an event from a first device, the event being captured in the first device and associated with a term of an article, the event being indexed and associated with the term in a first index of the first device; and
>
> indexing the event in a second index of the second device such that the event is associated with the term in the second index.

As amended, the independent claim beneficially recites a method that receives in a second device an event from a first device. The event is captured in the first device and is associated with a term of an article. The event is indexed and associated with the term in a first index of the first device. The method indexes the event in a second index of the second device such that the event is associated with the term in the second index. Because the first index of the first device and the second index of the second device index the same captured event and associate it with the same term, a search of the term relying on the first index and a search of the term relying on the second index can both return search results including the captured event. Therefore, users are not limited to conducting searches in devices where the event is captured.

Culliss, among other differences, does not disclose indexing the event in the device in which the event is captured and in a separate device. Culliss, in contrast, discloses a method of sorting search results based on user activities. See Culliss, Abstract. The Culliss system monitors user search activity (e.g., selecting an article from a search result), and updates key term scores based on the user search activity (e.g.,

altering key term scores for the selected article). See Culliss, col. 4, line 20 through col. 5, line 18 and FIG. 1. Therefore, in Culliss, user search activities affect existing article indexes. See Culliss, col. 4, col. 4, lines 52-56. As suggested in col. 3, lines 56-60, Culliss maintains a single index. See Culliss, col. 3, lines 56-60 ("The present invention maintains an index of key words …"). Therefore, Culliss does not teach or suggest indexing a captured event in two indexes, one index in the device in which the event is captured, and the other index in a second device, as is claimed in independent claim 1.

In view of the above, Culliss fails to disclose each and every limitation recited in independent claim 1. Thus, independent claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over Culliss. Independent claims 19 and 36, and the dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reason. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 102 rejections is respectfully requested.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a) in View of Culliss and Hartsell

In paragraphs 20-32 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 7-14 and 25-30 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Culliss in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0049608 A1 to Hartsell et al. ("Hartsell"). This rejection is moot in view of the above amendments in independent claims 1, 19, and 36.

As argued above with respect to claim 1, Culliss fails to disclose indexing a captured event in two indexes, one index in the device in which the event is captured, and the other index in a second device. Hartsell similarly fails. Hartsell discloses methods and systems for providing a service to deliver content or services in a network environment. See Hartsell, Abstract. Hartsell is unrelated to indexing events and fails to disclose the claimed limitations not disclosed in Culliss.

In view of the above, Culliss and Hartsell, whether considered individually or in combination, fail to disclose each and every limitation recited in independent claims 1, 19, and 36. Thus, independent claims 1, 19, and 36 are patentable over Culliss and Hartsell. The dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103 rejections is respectfully requested.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a) in View of Culliss and Vleet

In paragraph 33 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 35 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Culliss in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2005/0033803 A1 to Vleet et al. ("Vleet"). This rejection is traversed.

Independent claim 35 recites a method that captures an event including event data and associates an event ID with the event. The method associates the event ID with terms in a first index that comprises the event and stores the event in a first repository. The method retrieves the event and sends it to a second client, which associates it with a new event ID. The method associates the new event ID with terms in a second index that comprise the event and stores the event in a second repository. The two indexes and two repositories are substantially the same.

As argued above with respect to claim 1, Culliss fails to disclose indexing an event in two indexes. Vleet similarly fails. Vleet discloses a website system including an event history server system that persistently stores event data reflective of events that occur during browsing sessions of website users, and makes such data available to other applications and services. See Vleet, Abstract. Similar to Culliss, the Vleet system merely teaches indexing event objects in a single index. See Vleet, paragraph [0026] ("The event objects are preferably stored and indexed within the event history server ..."). Therefore, similar to Culliss, Vleet fails to disclose indexing an event in two indexes as is claimed in independent claim 35.

In view of the above, Culliss and Vleet, whether considered individually or in combination, fail to disclose each and every limitation recited in independent claim 35. Thus, independent claim 35 is patentable over Culliss and Vleet. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103 rejections is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-36, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 35 is amended to address antecedent basis issues and this amendment does not necessitate a new ground of rejection. Pursuant to MPEP § 706.07(a), the Examiner shall not make the next action final if a new ground of rejection for independent claim 35 is introduced.

Should the Examiner wish to discuss the above amendments or if the Examiner believes that for any reason direct contact with Applicants' representative would help to advance the prosecution of this case to finality, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,
Stephen R. Lawrence et al.

Dated: _____January 10, 2008_____   By: _____/Jie Zhang/_____
Jie Zhang, Reg. No. 60,242
Attorney for Applicants
Fenwick & West LLP
Silicon Valley Center
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Tel.: (650) 335-7297
Fax: (650) 938-5200